A Question Of Honour And Personal Knowing

In the latest attempt to claim that David Myatt (DM) is Anton Long (AL) of O9A fame an anonymous person has written, and via 'social media' promoted, a lengthy blog post about DM with his/her/their conclusion being that an interview published in a provincial newspaper in 1974 is the 'primary source' that proves that DM=AL and was the founder of the O9A.

In the item the anonymous person claims, without providing any evidence whatsoever, that Myatt does or did use the pseudonyms Rachael Stirling, Kerri Scott, Egnatius Severin, Gelis Sangster, and R. Parker, and is now active on the Bluesky social media platform as "Oxfordian23", "sirida21" and uses the 'nym "sol73omega".

In regard to the 1974 interview the anonymous person apparently accepts without question that what the now deceased journalist wrote is "the whole truth and nothing but the truth" and therefore is a primary source. Which seems to imply that journalists are trustworthy and never lie and never have a personal or political agenda or motive.

It is perhaps pertinent that the anonymous person does not mention that DM in the 1990s challenged two journalists to a duel with deadly weapons for publicly making unproven accusations about him and that both journalists lacked the character to accept the challenge or in lieu issue an apology. As Myatt wrote {1} years later:

<begin quote>
"In respect of rumours and allegations, I have, on a few occasions, challenged some individuals to a duel with deadly weapons, according to the etiquette of duelling. Not one of the individuals so challenged to a duel had the honour to accept, or issue a public apology in lieu of fighting such a duel. As I wrote some thirteen or more years ago:

"I have never bothered to have recourse to civil law, and established Courts, to sue those making libellous allegations about me quite simply because the only law I believe in and strive to uphold is the law of personal honour. Given that I have challenged two journalists, according to the law of personal honour, to a duel with deadly weapons for making such malicious allegations, and given that they did not have the honour to accept this challenge or issue an apology in lieu of fighting a duel, I consider my honour vindicated."

Such challenges, the lack of evidence to support the allegations and rumours, and the refusal of those so challenged to a duel of honour to either fight that duel of honour or issue an apology, reveals the truth of this particular matter – at least to those possessed of arête."
<end quote>

Of that 1974 interview Myatt wrote:

<begin quote>
"The journalist promised to let me read his final copy before it was published – a condition I had specified before giving the interview – and several photographs of me were taken, with him suggesting I hold something to do with the Occult, since he had noticed I had a collection of horror, and Occult, fiction (most of which in fact were given or loaned to me by Eddy Morrison). Perhaps foolishly, I agreed, holding up some Occult thingy which Joe Short had given to me a few days before.

Our conversation lasted for about half an hour, during which the journalist took a few notes (it was not recorded).

I assumed that he would simply recount what I had said. Of course he neither showed me the article before publication, nor printed what I said, except for one short sentence about causing chaos. The journalist also made some rather silly allegations about animal sacrifice, which were investigated at the time by both the
Police and the RSPCA whose conclusion was that they were fabrications concocted by the journalist, and perhaps, as I concluded, to get his name on the front page of the newspaper and sell more copies. What surprised me (and to be honest, upset me, for a while), after this interview, was how so many people believed everything the journalist had written, without bothering to ask me for my side of the story. As if just because something was printed in some newspaper or other then "it must be true" or – as the cliché of mundanes goes: "there is no smoke without fire." And it was then that I learnt several valuable lessons: just how easily people can be manipulated, just how dishonest and conniving (and thus dishonourable) some journalists seemed to be, by nature; and just how powerful the established Media was, able make or break a person's reputation."
<end quote>

He also wrote:

<begin quote>
"My own rather old-fashioned view is and was that a personal knowing of someone, extending over a period of many months if not a year or more, is the only honourable way to form a reasoned opinion about someone. For honour means the cultivation of traditional gentlemanly and ladylike virtues and one of which virtues is that we strive to treat other human beings in a fair way; ignoring what others have said or written about them; ignoring their past (real or alleged); and giving them the benefit of the doubt unless and until direct personal experience, direct knowledge of them, reveals them to be dishonourable."
<end quote>

The issue therefore becomes a simple one: a question of personal character, of civilized behaviour. Of whether one believes Myatt's version of events, or gives him the benefit of doubt, or believes the allegations and assumptions of others whomsoever those others are. Myatt's version of those times is described in *Myngath* {2} and *A Matter Of Honour*. {1}

Seen in this way, the 2026 post by an anonymous person seems symptomatic of our times. Just as he/she/they will no doubt assume this riposte was written by DM himself.

Egnatius Severin
January 2026

{1} *A Matter Of Honour,* https://davidmyatt.wordpress.com/about/a-matter-of-honour-2/
{2} *Myngath*, https://davidmyatt.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/david-myatt-myngath.pdf